

Uniform boundedness for rational points

Patricia L. Pacelli

Department of Mathematics, Boston University

111 Cummington Street, Boston, MA 02215

pacelli@math.bu.edu

February 5, 2008

This is a preliminary version

1 Introduction

According to a famous conjecture of S. Lang's, if K is a number field, then the set of K -rational points of any variety of general type defined over K is not dense in the Zariski topology. In a recent paper, entitled *Uniformity of rational points* ([CHM]), L. Caporaso, J. Harris, and B. Mazur show that this conjecture implies the existence of a uniform bound on the number of K -rational points over all smooth curves of genus g defined over K , for some fixed $g \geq 2$. Their bound depends on the genus g and on the number field K .

D. Abramovich has proved an extension of this result. In his paper, [A], he proves that, assuming Lang's conjecture, the bound $B(K, g)$ of [CHM] remains bounded as K varies over all quadratic number fields, or as K varies over all quadratic extensions of a fixed number field.

It is this result of Abramovich's that we shall generalize in this paper. We will prove that given a number field K , Lang's conjecture implies the existence of a uniform bound on the number of L -rational points over all smooth curves of a fixed genus $g > 1$ defined over L , as L varies over all extensions of K of degree d for any positive integer d . This bound will depend on K , d , and g , but is independent of the actual number field L .

Theorem 1.1 *Assume that Lang's conjecture regarding varieties of general type is true. Let $g \geq 2$ and $d \geq 1$ be integers, and let K be a number field. Then there exists an integer $B_K(d, g)$, which, for a given K depends only d and g , such that for any extension L of K of degree d , and any curve C of genus g defined over L , it follows that*

$$\#C(L) \leq B_K(d, g).$$

By letting $K = \mathbf{Q}$ we have the following:

Corollary 1.2 *Assume Lang's conjecture is true. Let $g \geq 2$ and $d \geq 1$ be integers. Then there exists a bound $B(d, g)$, depending only on d and g , such that for any number field L of degree d , and for any curve C of genus g defined over L , it follows that*

$$\#C(L) \leq B(d, g).$$

Since any extension L of K of degree d is a number field of some fixed degree d' , Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 are equivalent. We state Theorem 1.1 separately, however, as it might be interesting to study the dependence of the bound on K in later work, perhaps to see what happens assuming Lang's so-called strong conjecture.

1.1 Acknowledgements

I am extremely grateful to Dan Abramovich for introducing me to this interesting problem. His guidance and assistance have been invaluable. I would also like to thank Emma Previato and Lucia Caporaso for listening to presentations of this material, and Joseph Silverman for giving me advice and comments. Finally, I owe a tremendous amount of thanks to Glenn Stevens, for both the mathematics he has taught and the encouragement he has provided.

2 Definitions, Notation, and Ideas

Lang's conjecture concerns varieties of general type. Recall the definitions:

Definition 2.1 *A line bundle L on a variety Y is said to be big if for high values of k , $H^0(Y, L^k)$ has enough sections to induce a birational map to projective space.*

Definition 2.2 *A smooth projective variety Y is of general type if its dualizing sheaf ω_Y is big. An arbitrary projective variety is of general type if a desingularization of it is.*

The main idea we will be working with is that given a family of curves $X \rightarrow B$, we can study the symmetric d -th power of the n -th fibered product (for some sufficiently large n),

$$\mathrm{Sym}^d(X_B^n) = (X_B^n)^d / S_d.$$

For our purposes we will take the family $X \rightarrow B$ that we work with to be a *tautological family*. This is a family $X \rightarrow B$ of stable curves along with a finite surjective map $\phi: B \rightarrow \overline{M}_g$, where $\overline{M}_g$ is the moduli space of smooth stable curves of genus g . The map ϕ is assumed to have the property that $\phi(b) = [X_b]$ for all $b \in B$. See [CHM], §5.1 for a proof that such a family exists. The reason we work with a tautological family is quite simple; our theorem asserts that there is a bound on the number of rational points on any smooth curve of genus g - hence we want a family in which every such curve appears as a fiber, possibly after a field extension of bounded degree.

Assume $d \geq 1$ and $g \geq 2$ to be fixed integers throughout the remainder of the paper, where d represents the degree of an extension of number fields $K \subseteq L$, and g represents the genus of the curves we will be looking at. Following the notation in [A], write

$$Y_n = \mathrm{Sym}^d(X_B^n).$$

Let L be an extension of K of degree d , and let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n$ be the d embeddings of L in $\overline{K}$ fixing K . Then if $b \in B(L)$, and $(P_1, \dots, P_n) \in X_b(L)$, we obtain a K -rational point $y_{(P_1, \dots, P_n)}$ of Y_n :

$$y_{(P_1, \dots, P_n)} = \{(P_1, \dots, P_n)^{\sigma_1}, \dots, (P_1, \dots, P_n)^{\sigma_d}\}$$

Definition 2.3 For a variety V defined over K and a field extension $K \subset L$, let $V(L, K)$ be the set of those points lying on the variety V which are defined over L but are not defined over K nor any other intermediate field between K and L .

Definition 2.4 Let $m \geq n$. Again following [A], we call a point $y_{(P_1, \dots, P_n)} \in Y_n(K)$ m -prolongable if there exists a number field L , $[L:K] = d$, and a prolongation $y_{(P_1, \dots, P_m)} \in Y_m(K)$ such that $P_i \in X(L, K)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq m$, and if $1 \leq i \neq j \leq m$ then $P_i \neq P_j$. In other words, $y_{(P_1, \dots, P_n)} \in Y_n$ is m -prolongable if the n points $P_1, \dots, P_n$ can be extended to m distinct points $P_1, \dots, P_m \in X(L, K)$, producing a point $y_{(P_1, \dots, P_m)} \in Y_m$.

We will call $E_n^{(m)}$ the set of m -prolongable points in Y_n , and will denote by $F_n^{(m)}$ the Zariski closure $\overline{E_n^{(m)}}$.

Lemma 2.5 For all $n \geq 1$, there exists an integer $m(n)$ such that for all positive integers k ,

$$F_n^{(m(n)+k)} = F_n^{(m(n))}.$$

Proof: Since $F_n^{(m+1)} \subseteq F_n^{(m)}$, the $F_n^{(m)}$'s form a decreasing sequence of closed sets in the noetherian space Y_n , which must eventually stop. So for all n there is an integer $m(n)$ such that $F_n^{(m(n)+k)} = F_n^{(m(n))}$ for all positive integers k . Q.E.D.

To ease notation we will write F_n for $F_n^{(m(n))}$.

Our goal is to show that each F_n is empty. For each n , F_n is the closure of those n -tuples of distinct points defined over L which can be extended to arbitrarily long m -tuples of distinct points over the same field. If we show that each F_n is empty, this shows that there must be a bound of the desired type.

We want to look at some of the properties of the F_n 's, and study the maps between them. The ideas in the remainder of this section are generalizations of those found in [A].

Lemma 2.6 Suppose $n' > n$ and $I \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n'\}$ is an n -tuple. Then the projection $\pi_I : F_{n'} \rightarrow F_n$ is surjective.

Proof: This is clearly true for the $E_n^{(m)}$'s by definition. Thus the same holds for the F_n 's. Q.E.D.

We have a natural finite map

$$\pi_{n,k} : F_{n+k} \rightarrow (F_{n+1})_{F_n}^k.$$

To see this, look at the case where $k = 2$. If we consider an element $y \in F_{n+2}$, then y can be written as:

$$y = \{(P_{1,1}, \dots, P_{n,1}, P_{n+1,1}, P_{n+2,1}), \dots, (P_{1,d}, \dots, P_{n,d}, P_{n+1,d}, P_{n+2,d})\}$$

The map $\pi_{n,2}$ is defined by sending y to the following two elements of F_{n+1} :

$$\{(P_{1,1}, \dots, P_{n,1}, P_{n+1,1}), \dots, (P_{1,d}, \dots, P_{n,d}, P_{n+1,d})\}$$

and

$$\{(P_{1,1}, \dots, P_{n,1}, P_{n+2,1}), \dots, (P_{1,d}, \dots, P_{n,d}, P_{n+2,d})\}$$

These two elements together form an element of $(F_{n+1})_{F_n}^2$, thus defining $\pi_{n,2}(y)$.

Similiarly, an induction argument shows that F_{n+k} maps finitely to $(F_{n+1})_{F_n}^k$.

Notice that by definition the E_n 's and the F_n 's are not contained in the *big diagonal* in Y_n ; by the big diagonal, we mean the set of n -tuples for which at least 2 entries agree. Consider the following lemma from [A]:

Lemma 2.7 (see [A], Lemma 1) *Let $D \rightarrow Z$ be a generically finite morphism, and let Δ_n be the big diagonal in D_Z^n . Then there exists an integer n for which the n -th fiber product of D over Z , $D_Z^n \setminus \Delta_n \rightarrow Z$, is not dominant.*

If we let $D = F_{n+1}$, $Z = F_n$, then this lemma shows that if $y \in F_n$ then the dimension of the fiber above y in F_{n+1} is at least 1. This means that any component of F_n has a component of F_{n+1} above it of positive dimension. Moreover, the lemma shows that if y is in F_n and if k is a positive integer, then the dimension of the fiber above y in F_{n+k} is at least k .

We want to perform an induction argument on the relative dimension of F_{n+1} over F_n to show that F_n is empty for all n . We know that this dimension can't be greater than d , as this is the relative dimension of Y_{n+1} over Y_n , and we also know that it is at least 1, by the lemma above. What we will do is show that, for any l , if the relative dimension of F_{n+1} over F_n is at least l then it must be at least $l + 1$. Eventually we will get to $l = d$ where the argument must stop, and we will have to conclude that each F_n is empty.

Assume that for all n and for all $y \in F_n$, the dimension of the fiber above y in F_{n+1} is greater than or equal to l . Suppose there exists an element $y \in F_n$ with the dimension of the fiber above y in F_{n+1} exactly l . By the semicontinuity of the fiber dimension of projective maps, there is an irreducible component of F_n , call it M_n , with the properties that M_n contains y , and the general fibers in F_{n+1} over M_n have dimension equal to l . It also follows by induction that for any integer k the dimensions of the fibers in F_{n+k} above M_n have dimension equal to kl .

Consider the following diagram where, as you may recall, the top map is finite and birational.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F_{n+k} & \longrightarrow & (F_{n+1})_{F_n}^k \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \\ & & F_n \end{array}$$

Because the map $F_{n+k} \rightarrow (F_{n+1})_{F_n}^k$ is finite, there exists at least one irreducible component H_k of F_{n+k} which dominates a component of $(F_{n+1})_{F_n}^k$; this component of $(F_{n+1})_{F_n}^k$ dominates M_n and has maximal relative dimension kl over F_n .

Later in this paper we will prove the following important proposition:

Proposition 2.8 *For large values of k and n every component of the fiber product $(F_{n+1})_{F_n}^k$ of maximal relative dimension is a variety of general type.*

Therefore, for large k , H_k dominates a variety of general type, and because the map from F_{n+k} to $(F_{n+1})_{F_n}^k$ is birational, we can conclude that for large enough k and n , F_{n+k} is also a variety of general type. Remember, however, that by definition the set of rational points in F_{n+k} is dense. Thus Lang's conjecture combined with the work above implies a contradiction. Thus we have discomvered that for all n and for all $y \in F_n$, the dimension of the fiber above y in F_{n+1} must be at least $l + 1$.

Continuing by induction on this relative dimension, we will be forced to conclude that if Lang's conjecture is true, we have a contradiction unless F_{n+k} is empty for large values of k and n . Since we have surjective projections from $F_{n+1} \rightarrow F_n$ for all n , however, this implies that all of the F_n 's must be empty, hence proving Theorem 1.1.

The remainder of the paper will be devoted to proving Proposition 2.8.

3 Background Lemmas and Definitions

In definition 2.1, we defined a big line bundle; now we provide an extension of that definition which shall be quite useful.

Definition 3.1 *If L is a line bundle on a variety Z and $\mathcal{J}$ is an ideal sheaf on Z , then we define $L \otimes \mathcal{J}$ to be big if for high values of k , $H^0(L^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathcal{J}^k)$ induces a birational map to projective space P^N for some N .*

Lemma 3.2 *Assume Z is a projective irreducible variety of $\dim l > 0$, and that*

$$Z \subseteq C_1 \times \cdots \times C_d$$

where the C_i 's are irreducible projective curves. Suppose further that for some $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ the projection map $\pi_i : Z \rightarrow C_i$ is surjective. Then there exists a set $J \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $i \in J$, $\#J = l$, and the projection map

$$\pi_J : Z \rightarrow \prod_{j \in J} C_j$$

is surjective.

Proof: We proceed with induction on d . If $d = 1$, we simply have $Z \subseteq C_1$; hence it must be that both $i = 1$ and $l = 1$. We use the fact that the inclusion map from Z to C_1 must be either constant or surjective, but as Z has positive dimension, it can't be constant. Therefore the lemma holds, with $J = \{1\}$.

Assume the result true for $d - 1$ curves, and suppose that we have $Z \subseteq C_1 \times \cdots \times C_d$, with Z surjecting onto C_i for some $1 \leq i \leq d$. Choose $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ to be a subset of cardinality $d - 1$ with the property that $i \in I$, and let π_I be the projection map

$$\pi_I : Z \rightarrow \prod_{i \in I} C_i.$$

Define $Z_I = \pi_I(Z)$. We know that Z_I is an irreducible projective variety, with dimension either l or $l - 1$.

If Z_I has dimension l , the induction hypothesis produces a set $J \subseteq I$ such that $i \in J$, $\#J = l$, and the projection map

$$\pi_J : Z_I \rightarrow \prod_{j \in J} C_j$$

is surjective. Clearly Z surjects to Z_I , so by composition we obtain a surjection

$$Z \rightarrow \prod_{j \in J} C_j.$$

Now suppose that Z_I has dimension $l - 1$. The induction hypothesis gives a set $J \subseteq I$ such that $i \in J$, $\#J = l - 1$, and the projection map

$$\pi_J : Z_I \rightarrow \prod_{j \in J} C_j$$

is surjective. Let $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ be the one element which is not in the set I . Consider $Z_I \times C_k$. A simple dimension argument shows that this is equal to Z . Therefore we have a surjection

$$Z = Z_I \times C_k \rightarrow \prod_{j \in J} C_j \times C_k.$$

Therefore Z surjects onto a product of l curves, as desired. Q.E.D.

Lemma 3.3 *Lemma 3.2 above still holds if we replace $Z \subseteq C_1 \times \cdots \times C_d$ with a fiber product of families of curves $Z \subseteq C_1 \times_B \cdots \times_B C_d$ where B is a projective variety, the C_i form a family of curves over B , and that for some i the projection map from Z the family C_i is surjective.*

Proof: Let $\eta \in B$ be a generic point. Because Z surjects to each family C_i , it follows that each generic fiber of Z surjects to generic fibers of curves. In other words, we may apply lemma 3.2 to the fiber Z_η . We obtain a set J of size l with $i \in J$ such that we have a surjective and generically finite projection map

$$\pi_J : Z_\eta \rightarrow \prod_{j \in J} C_{i,\eta}$$

where the product above is a fiber product over B . Because generic points and fibers are dense, we know that the projection map

$$\pi_J : Z \rightarrow \prod_{j \in J} C_j$$

is generically finite (where the above product is once again a fiber product over B). The properness of the projection map implies the surjectivity of π_J . Q.E.D.

Lemma 3.4 *Suppose we have two surjective maps $g_i : Z_i \rightarrow B$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then the two natural maps $f_i : Z_1 \times_B Z_2 \rightarrow Z_i$, $i = 1, 2$, are also surjective.*

Proof: To show that f_1 is surjective, choose an element $z_1 \in Z_1$. Let $b = g_1(z_1)$. Then there exists a $z_2 \in Z_2$ such that $g_2(z_2) = b$, as g_2 is surjective. It follows that $(z_1, z_2) \in Z_1 \times_B Z_2$ and $f_1((z_1, z_2)) = z_1$. A similar argument shows that the map f_2 is also surjective. Q.E.D.

Lemma 3.5 *Let $Y \subseteq Z_1 \times Z_2$ be a variety, and let $f_i : Y \rightarrow Z_i$ be surjective projection maps for $i = 1, 2$. Suppose L_1 and L_2 are big line bundles on Z_1 and Z_2 respectively. Then the line bundle*

$$f_1^* L_1 \otimes f_2^* L_2$$

is big. Further, if $\mathcal{J}_1$ and $\mathcal{J}_2$ are ideal sheaves on Z_1 and Z_2 , such that each $L_i \otimes \mathcal{J}_i$ is big on Z_i , then it follows that

$$f_1^*(L_1) \otimes f_2^*(L_2) \otimes (f_1^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_1) \cdot f_2^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_2))$$

is big on Y . Finally, the above still holds if we replace $Y \subseteq Z_1 \times Z_2$ by a variety Y which maps generically finitely to $Z_1 \times Z_2$,

$$h : Y \rightarrow h(Y) \subseteq Z_1 \times Z_2$$

provided that the projections from $h(Y)$ to Z_i are still surjective.

Proof: The first statement is a consequence of the second; hence we just prove the second.

By assumption, since each $L_i \otimes \mathcal{J}_i$ is big on Z_i , there exists open sets $U_i \subseteq Z_i$ such that for large k , global sections of $H^0(Z_i, L_i^k \otimes \mathcal{J}_i^k)$ separate points in U_i . Let $U = f_1^{-1}(U_1) \cap f_2^{-1}(U_2)$, and let $P = (P_1, P_2), Q = (Q_1, Q_2) \in U$. We claim that we can produce sections of

$$H^0(Z_1 \times Z_2, f_1^*(L_1) \otimes f_2^*(L_2) \otimes (f_1^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_1) \cdot f_2^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_2)))$$

for large k which separate P and Q . In other words, there is a section vanishing at P and not at Q , and vice versa. This will show that there are enough sections to induce a birational map to projective space, hence this will suffice to show that

$$f_1^*(L_1) \otimes f_2^*(L_2) \otimes (f_1^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_1) \cdot f_2^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_2))$$

is big.

We have the following map:

$$f_1^* \otimes f_2^* : H^0(L_1^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathcal{J}_1^k) \otimes H^0(L_2^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathcal{J}_2^k) \rightarrow H^0(f_1^*(L_1) \otimes f_2^*(L_2) \otimes (f_1^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_1) \cdot f_2^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_2)))$$

Therefore, sections of $H^0(Z_1 \times Z_2, f_1^*(L_1) \otimes f_2^*(L_2) \otimes (f_1^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_1) \cdot f_2^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_2)))$ have the form

$$f_1^*(s_i) \otimes f_2^*(r_j)$$

where $\{s_i\}$ and $\{r_j\}$ form bases for $H^0(Z_1, L_1^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathcal{J}_1^k)$ and $H^0(Z_2, L_2^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathcal{J}_2^k)$, respectively.

Because P_1 and Q_1 are elements of U_1 , it follows that there exists a section $s \in H^0(Z_1, L_1^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathcal{J}_1^k)$ such that $s(P_1) = 0$ but $s(Q_1) \neq 0$. Similarly, there exists a section $r \in H^0(Z_2, L_2^{\otimes k} \otimes \mathcal{J}_2^k)$ such that $r(P_2) = 0$, but $r(Q_2) \neq 0$. Consider the section $f_1^*s \times f_2^*r$. It follows that

$$f_1^*s \times f_2^*r(P) = (s(P_1), r(P_2)) = 0$$

and

$$f_1^*s \times f_2^*r(Q) = (s(Q_1), r(Q_2)) \neq 0.$$

Similarly, we can find a section of $H^0(Z_1 \times Z_2, f_1^*(L_1) \otimes f_2^*(L_2) \otimes (f_1^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_1) \cdot f_2^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_2)))$, which vanishes on Q but not on P . Therefore, for large k , sections of $H^0(Z_1 \times Z_2, f_1^*(L_1) \otimes f_2^*(L_2) \otimes (f_1^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_1) \cdot f_2^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_2)))$ generically separate points. Hence, we have that

$$f_1^*(L_1) \otimes f_2^*(L_2) \otimes (f_1^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_1) \cdot f_2^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_2))$$

is big.

We now prove the last statement of the lemma. Since $h(Y)$ surjects both Z_1 and Z_2 , the work above shows that $f_1^*(L_1) \otimes f_2^*(L_2) \otimes (f_1^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_1) \cdot f_2^{-1}(\mathcal{J}_2))$ is big on $h(Y)$. Now $h : Y \rightarrow h(Y)$ is a generically finite surjective morphism; hence the pullback of a big sheaf on $h(Y)$ will be big on Y . Q.E.D.

4 The Proof

Recall that for a given n , F_n is contained in $Y_n = \text{Sym}^d(X_B^n)$. Let $X_n = (X_B^n)^d$. Then we have a map $\sigma : X_n \rightarrow Y_n$, namely the quotient map given by action of S_d . Now we can look at the inverse image of F_n under σ , which is contained in X_n . Call it G_n .

These varieties G_n will be central to our proof. We can think of the G_n 's as forming a tower: we have projection maps $\pi : G_{n+1} \rightarrow G_n$ such that

$$\pi(G_{n+1}) = G_n.$$

Fix n . Let l be the relative dimension of G_{n+1} over G_n . Let ϕ be the projection of G_n down to B^d , and for $i = 1, \dots, d$, denote by π_i the d projections from B^d to B . Notice that because the image of G_n in $(X_B^{n-1})^d$ is G_{n-1} , it follows that no matter which n we start with the image $\phi(G_n)$ in B^d is the same. Define $B_i \subseteq B$ to be the image of an irreducible component of G_n in B under the map $\pi_i \circ \phi$. We shall see later that it is enough to restrict our attention to one component of G_n , hence, we do so now.

Choose

$$\mathcal{B} \subseteq B_1 \times B_2 \times \dots \times B_d$$

to be a component of $\phi(G_n)$ such that $\mathcal{B}$ surjects to each component B_i . Let $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ be a desingularization of $\mathcal{B}$. By Hironaka's Theorem we know we can choose this desingularization such that the discriminant locus is a divisor with normal crossings.

We have the following diagram:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \subseteq B_1 \times \dots \times B_d \subseteq B^d \rightarrow B$$

Notice that we have d choices for the last map in the above diagram, namely the d projections π_i . Let $g_i : \tilde{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow B$ be the composition of the above where π_i is chosen as the last mapping.

Define families of curves

$$C_i = g_i^*(X \rightarrow B) = X \times_B \tilde{\mathcal{B}}.$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_i & \longrightarrow & X \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \tilde{\mathcal{B}} & \xrightarrow{g_i} & B \end{array}$$

We now pull back the varieties G_n to $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$; to simplify matters, we shall keep the same notation G_n . We then also need to pull back the families C_i to G_n . Again, it is easiest to abuse notation, and still refer to them as C_i . In our new situation we have the following containment:

$$G_{n+1} \subseteq C_1 \times_{G_n} \dots \times_{G_n} C_d.$$

Our goal is to work with these varieties G_n to show that for large n , G_n is of general type, which will lead to our contradiction. Our main difficulty will be in avoiding the singularities of G_n . To do this, we will eventually be working with products of stable curves over the smooth base $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$. These curves will have canonical singularities, which are easier to control. We would like to have G_{n+1} surject onto each of these families of curves C_i . While this is not always so, we will show that we may reduce to this case.

For $i = 1, \dots, d$, define projection maps $p_i : G_{n+1} \rightarrow C_i$. To illustrate the situation, assume for a moment that G_{n+1} is irreducible. Then for each i , $p_i(G_{n+1})$ is an irreducible subvariety of C_i . Suppose that for one index i , the map is not surjective; without loss of generality assume that $p_1(G_{n+1}) = P$ where $P \subset C_1$ and has degree k over G_n . Now we go up k steps and use the fact that

$$G_{n+k+1} \subseteq (G_{n+1})_{G_n}^{k+1}.$$

In other words,

$$G_{n+k+1} \subseteq P_{G_n}^{k+1} \times_{G_n} C_2^{k+1} \times_{G_n} \dots \times_{G_n} C_d^{k+1}.$$

Since P consists of k points over G_n , the pigeon-hole principle says that two of the coordinates of $P_{G_n}^{k+1}$ must agree, contradicting the fact that G_{n+k} is not contained in the big diagonal.

Thus if G_{n+1} is irreducible, we see that it is contained inside a product of d families of curves fibered over G_n and that it surjects onto each family.

Now suppose that G_{n+1} consists of m irreducible components:

$$G_{n+1} = V_1 \cup V_2 \cup \cdots \cup V_m \subseteq C_1^m \times_{G_n} \cdots \times_{G_n} C_d^m.$$

Define projection maps $p_{i,j} : V_i \rightarrow C_j$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ and $1 \leq j \leq d$. We want to show that at least one V_i surjects onto all d curves. So suppose for contradiction that

$$p_{1,j(1)}(V_1) = S_1, \dots, p_{m,j(m)}(V_m) = S_m$$

where each $S_i \subset C_{j(i)}$ maps generically finitely to G_n with degree r_i .

Therefore, we know

$$G_{n+1} \subseteq (p_{1,1}(V_1) \times_{G_n} \cdots \times_{G_n} p_{1,d}(V_1)) \cup \cdots \cup (p_{m,1}(V_m) \times_{G_n} \cdots \times_{G_n} p_{m,d}(V_m))$$

and

$$G_{n+k} \subseteq (G_{n+1})_{G_n}^k$$

So G_{n+k} is contained in the above union fibered k times over G_n .

In taking elements of

$$(p_{1,1}(V_1) \times_{G_n} \cdots \times_{G_n} p_{1,d}(V_1))$$

we have only r_1 distinct choices for the $j(1)$ -st component. Continuing in this spirit, in taking an element of

$$(p_{m,1}(V_m) \times_{G_n} \cdots \times_{G_n} p_{m,d}(V_m))$$

we have only r_m distinct choices for the $j(m)$ -th entry.

Thus, if we take $k \geq r_1 + \cdots + r_m$, an element of G_{n+k} must have 2 coordinates equal, contradicting the fact that G_{n+k} is not contained in the big diagonal.

Therefore we know that if G_{n+1} at least one component of G_{n+1} surjects onto all d families of curves C_i .

Suppose once again that $G_{n+1} = V_1 \cup \cdots \cup V_m$. Define W_1 to be the union of those V_i which do not surject to each family C_i , or are not dominant over G_n . Define W_2 to be the union of those components which do surject onto each C_i ; by our work above, W_2 is not empty. Hence

$$G_{n+1} \subseteq W_1 \cup W_2$$

Choose a component G of G_{n+k} which is irreducible and dominant over G_n with relative dimension kl . We then have

$$G \subseteq G_{n+k} \subseteq (G_{n+1})_{G_n}^k \subseteq (W_1 \cup W_2)_{G_n}^k.$$

If we let J_1 and J_2 run over all subsets of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ such that $J_1 \cup J_2 = \{1, \dots, k\}$, then it follows that

$$G \subseteq \cup_{J_1, J_2} (W_1)_{G_n}^{J_1} \times_{G_n} (W_2)_{G_n}^{J_2}$$

Because W_1 and W_2 consist of unions of distinct components, and G is a component, it follows that for one choice of J_1 and J_2 , say $J_{1,k}$ and $J_{2,k}$ that

$$G \subseteq (W_1)_{G_n}^{J_{1,k}} \times_{G_n} (W_2)_{G_n}^{J_{2,k}}$$

Recall that G_{n+k} is not contained in the big diagonal. Therefore, applying the same reasoning as earlier, we conclude that there exists an integer r such that $\#J_{1,k} \leq r$ for all k . This is because, by definition, the set W_1 consists of elements of G_{n+1} which do not surject to all of the families of curves C_i . Since we know that $\#J_{1,k} + \#J_{2,k} = k$, it follows that $\#J_{2,k} \geq k - r$, and so as k grows, the size of the sets $J_{2,k}$ also grows. Since, by definition, components of W_2 surject to each of the families C_i , we can obtain a surjection

$$(W_2)_{G_n}^{J_{2,k}} \rightarrow C_1^{k_1} \times_{G_n} \cdots \times_{G_n} C_d^{k_d}$$

where we can make the exponents k_i as large as we wish, by taking larger values of k , since the size of $J_{2,k}$ grows with k .

Because G is a component of G_{n+1} of maximal dimension which is dominant over G_n , it follows that G dominates a component W of $(W_2)_{G_n}^{J_{2,k}}$. This component W is contained inside a product of, say, c of the components of W_2 . As k grows, so does $k - r$; for large values of $k - r$ at least one of those c components, call it W' , will appear at least $\kappa = \frac{k-r}{c}$ times, where κ also grows with k . Therefore G dominates $(W')_{G_n}^\kappa$.

As κ grows, $(W')_{G_n}^\kappa$ will be mapping surjectively to higher and higher powers of the families of curves C_i . In the rest of this paper we shall prove that this is exactly what is needed to show that $(W')_{G_n}^\kappa$ is a variety of general type. Moreover, we shall show that for κ large enough (i.e., for k large enough) $(W')_{G_n}^\kappa$ modulo the action of the symmetric group is a variety of general type.

Because G dominates $(W')_{G_n}^\kappa$ we obtain a family of varieties

$$G \rightarrow (W')_{G_n}^\kappa.$$

Because G_n is not contained in the fixed point locus, over each general point in $(W')_{G_n}^\kappa$, the fiber in G consists of a product of curves of genus g (as opposed to a quotient of products of curves). In other words, each fiber is a variety of general type, as is the base. We then utilize a theorem of Viehweg ([V], Satz III) to conclude that G itself is a variety of general type. Viehweg's theorem states that if $Z \rightarrow B$ is a family of varieties of general type where the base B is also of general type, then it follows that Z is of general type.

Let F be the image of G in F_{n+k} . Since G is of maximal dimension in G_{n+k} it follows that F is of maximal dimension in F_{n+k} . Since $(W')_{G_n}^\kappa$ modulo the group action is of general type, we may again apply Viehweg's theorem as above to see that F also is of general type, using that F is a family of varieties of general type over the image of $(W')_{G_n}^\kappa$ modulo the group action. Therefore, we've shown that for large $n + k$, a component of F_{n+k} of maximal dimension is a variety of general type, proving proposition 2.8.

Our work above proves the following proposition.

Proposition 4.1 *In order to prove Proposition 2.8, it suffices to prove it for the case where each G_n is irreducible.*

For the remainder of the paper, we shall assume that for all large n G_{n+1} consists of one irreducible component, which projects surjectively onto each family of curves.

Because we are assuming that G_{n+1} projects surjectively onto each C_i , we may apply lemma 3.3. We thus obtain d generically finite maps π_i from G_{n+1} to a product of the families of curves C_i fibered over G_n . In other words, for each $i = 1, \dots, d$ there exists a subset $J_i \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $\#J_i = l$, $i \in J_i$, and

$$\pi_{J_i} : G_n \rightarrow \prod_{j \in J_i} C_j.$$

Recall, however, that we can project G_n down to $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$; this allows us to obtain d generically finite surjective maps from G_{n+1} to a product of families of curves fibered over $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$.

Since each G_{n+k} is contained in a fiber product of G_{n+1} over G_n , we can apply the maps σ_i to each component of G_{n+1} in this product, and we can produce a generically finite map from G_{n+k} to a product of powers of the C_i :

$$G_{n+k} \rightarrow C_1^{k_1} \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \cdots \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_d^{k_d}.$$

By taking k large as necessary, we can increase the exponents k_i , making them as large as we wish.

To ease notation, for large n let

$$V_n = C_1^{k_1} \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \cdots \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_d^{k_d}.$$

So we have a generically finite map $G_n \rightarrow V_n$ where the exponents appearing in V_n can be made larger by increasing n .

Recall the statement of proposition 2.8, which says that for large values of n and k , every component of the fiber product $(F_{n+1})_{F_n}^k$ of maximal dimension is a variety of general type. We are ready to begin in earnest the proof of this proposition.

First, we prove two more lemmas which will be of assistance to us. The first statement in the following lemma is a well known fact, but we include it here, as we will utilize it later.

Lemma 4.2 *Let $f : V \rightarrow B$ be a flat morphism of irreducible projective varieties with irreducible general fiber. Let L be a big line bundle on V , and $\mathcal{J} \neq 0$ an ideal sheaf on V . Let*

$$\pi_i : V_B^k \rightarrow V$$

be projections from the fiber product to the i -th factor. Define L_k and $\mathcal{J}_k$ by

$$L_k = \otimes_i \pi_i^* L$$

and

$$\mathcal{J}_k = \sum_i \pi_i^{-1} \mathcal{J}.$$

Then:

1. *There exists an integer m such that $L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}$ is big on V ;*
2. *For high enough values of k , it follows that*

$$L_k \otimes \mathcal{J}_k$$

is big on V_B^k .

Proof: Consider the following exact sequence of cohomology groups:

$$0 \rightarrow H^0(V, L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}) \rightarrow H^0(V, L^{\otimes m}) \rightarrow H^0(V, L^{\otimes m}/L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}) \rightarrow 0$$

Because L is big, we know that the dimension of $H^0(V, L^{\otimes m})$ is $O(m^{\dim V})$. Since the zero set of a variety has a lower dimension, we have that the dimension of $H^0(V, L^{\otimes m}/L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J})$ is less than the dimension of $H^0(V, L^{\otimes m})$. Therefore, the dimension of $H^0(V, L^{\otimes m}/L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J})$ is less than or equal to $O(m^{\dim V-1})$. By counting the dimensions in the exact sequence, we can conclude that the dimension of $H^0(V, L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J})$ is greater than or equal to $O(m^{\dim V} - m^{\dim V-1})$. This growth in the dimension of $H^0(V, L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J})$ shows that there exists an m such that $L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}$ is big on V .

Because $\otimes \pi_i^* L^{\otimes m} = L_k^{\otimes m}$, we obtain a map

$$\otimes \pi_i^* H^0(V, L^{\otimes m}) \rightarrow H^0(V, \otimes \pi_i^* L^{\otimes m}).$$

The indices i range from 1 to k . The inclusions

$$\otimes \pi_i^* H^0(V, L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}) \hookrightarrow \otimes \pi_i^* H^0(V, L^{\otimes m})$$

and

$$H^0(V_B^k, L_k^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}_k^k) \hookrightarrow H^0(V_B^k, L_k^{\otimes m})$$

produce a commutative diagram inducing a map

$$\otimes \pi_i^* H^0(V, L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}) \hookrightarrow H^0(V_B^k, L_k^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}_k^k).$$

Notice also that if we choose $k > m$, we also have the inclusion

$$H^0(V_B^k, L_k^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}_k^k) \hookrightarrow H^0(V_B^k, L_k^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}_k^m)$$

since $\mathcal{J}_k^k \subseteq \mathcal{J}_k^m$.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \otimes_i \pi_i^* H^0(L^{\otimes m}) & \longrightarrow & H^0(L_k^{\otimes m}) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \otimes_i \pi_i^* H^0(L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}) & \longrightarrow & H^0(L_k^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}_k^k) \longrightarrow H^0(L_k^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}_k^m) \end{array}$$

As $L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J}$ is big, we have a birational map from V to P^n , induced by $H^0(V, L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J})$. The same reasoning as in Lemma 3.5 lets us conclude that we can use the sections of $H^0(V, L^{\otimes m} \otimes \mathcal{J})$ to generically separate points of V_B^k . Thus for large values of k it follows that $L_k \otimes \mathcal{J}_k$ is big on V_B^k . Q.E.D.

Lemma 4.3 *For large enough n , the relative dualizing sheaf*

$$\omega_{V_n/\tilde{B}}$$

is big, and furthermore, the dualizing sheaf

$$\omega_{V_n}$$

is also big.

Proof: Recall the following diagram:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow \mathcal{B} \hookrightarrow B_1 \times \cdots \times B_d \subseteq B^d \rightarrow B$$

Define $C_{i,0}$ to be the pullback of the family $X \rightarrow B$ to B_i . Lemma 3.4 in [CHM] states that the relative dualizing sheaf $\omega_{C_{i,0}/B_i}$ is big.

Choose n to be large, so that we have a generically finite map

$$G_n \rightarrow C_1^{k_1} \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \cdots \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_d^{k_d} = V_n.$$

Now for $i = 1, \dots, d$ consider the family

$$(C_{i,0})_{B_i}^{k_i} \rightarrow B_i.$$

Call this map f_i . Notice that

$$(C_{i,0})_{B_i}^{k_i} \subseteq (C_{i,0})^{k_i}.$$

Now, $C_{i,0}$ maps surjectively to B_i by definition. Hence lemma 3.4 implies that each projection

$$(C_{i,0})_{B_i}^{k_i} \rightarrow C_{i,0}$$

is surjective. Thus lemma 3.5 tells us that since $\omega_{C_{i,0}/B_i}$ is big on $C_{i,0}$, it follows that ω_{f_i} is big on $(C_{i,0})_{B_i}^{k_i}$.

Let ϕ be the map

$$\phi : \mathcal{B} \hookrightarrow B_1 \times \cdots \times B_d.$$

Let $V_{n,0}$ be the pullback under ϕ of the family

$$(C_{1,0})_{B_1}^{k_1} \times \cdots \times (C_{d,0})_{B_d}^{k_d} \rightarrow B_1 \times \cdots \times B_d$$

Thus

$$V_{n,0} \hookrightarrow (C_{1,0})_{B_1}^{k_1} \times \cdots \times (C_{d,0})_{B_d}^{k_d}$$

We also have surjective projections

$$V_{n,0} \rightarrow (C_{i,0})_{B_i}^{k_i}$$

They are surjective because $\mathcal{B}$ was chosen so as to project onto each component of $B_1 \times \cdots \times B_d$. Therefore, lemma 3.5 tells us that $\omega_{V_{n,0}/\mathcal{B}}$ is big, since each ω_{f_i} is big on $(C_{i,0})_{B_i}^{k_i}$.

Let ψ be the map

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}.$$

We have that V_n is the pullback of $V_{n,0}$ under ψ . Thus we know that

$$\omega_{V_n/\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} = \psi^* \omega_{V_{n,0}/\mathcal{B}}$$

and since ψ is a generically finite map, it follows that $\omega_{V_n/\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}$ is big.

It remains to show that the dualizing sheaf ω_{V_n} is big. Recall that

$$\omega_{V_n} = \omega_{V_n/\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \otimes \omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}$$

Choose $\mathcal{I}$ to be an ideal on the base $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ such that there is an injection

$$\mathcal{I} \hookrightarrow \omega_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}.$$

It will be sufficient to show that

$$\omega_{V_n/\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \otimes \mathcal{I}$$

is big.

To do this, define Z to be the restriction of X^d to $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$. In other words,

$$Z = C_1 \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \cdots \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_d.$$

By Lemma 3.4 in [CHM] we know that $\omega_{Z/\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}$ is big. Recall that by choosing n large enough we can control the size of the exponents in V_n , making them as large as we wish. Therefore, for any integer m there exists an integer n_m such that if $n > n_m$, all the k_i are greater than m . Write

$$k_i - m = r_i > 0.$$

Then we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} V_n &= C_1^{r_1} \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \cdots \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_d^{r_d} \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_1^m \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \cdots \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_d^m \\ &= C_1^{r_1} \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \cdots \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_d^{r_d} \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} Z_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}^m \\ &= V' \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} Z_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}^m \end{aligned}$$

where we define V' to equal $C_1^{r_1} \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \cdots \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_d^{r_d}$.

The first part of this lemma shows that for large enough n , $\omega_{V'/\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}$ is big on V' . Lemma 4.2 states that, since $\omega_{Z/\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}$ is big on Z , for large enough m ,

$$\omega_{Z_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}^m} \otimes \mathcal{I}$$

is big on $Z_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}^m$.

We now apply Lemma 3.5 to see that

$$\omega_{V'/\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \otimes (\omega_{Z_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}^m} \otimes \mathcal{I})$$

is big on $V' \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} Z_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}^m$. In other words,

$$\omega_{V_n/\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \otimes \mathcal{I}$$

is big, as desired; hence ω_{V_n} is big on V_n . Q.E.D.

We're almost ready to prove Proposition 2.8. Let us set up some notation first.

Let $\widetilde{G_{n+k}}$ be an equivariant desingularization of G_{n+k} . In other words, the action of a subgroup of the symmetric group S_d on $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$ and G_{n+k} lifts to $\widetilde{G_{n+k}}$. Let r be the map from $\widetilde{G_{n+k}}$ to G_{n+k} which gives the resolution of singularities. Let Φ_{n+1} and Φ_{n+k} denote the set of points of G_{n+1} and G_{n+k} , respectively, which are fixed by the group action.

Recall that we have a generically finite map, call it σ_0 , from G_n to V_n :

$$\sigma_0 : G_n \rightarrow V_n = C_1^{k_1} \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \cdots \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_d^{k_d}.$$

For $i = 1, \dots, d$, denote by σ_i the d projections from G_{n+1} to a product of l families of curves, where l is the relative dimension of G_{n+1} over G_n . Let Z_i be the image of G_{n+1} under σ_i . We can write

$$Z_i = C_{j_1(i)} \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \cdots \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_{j_l(i)}$$

where one of $j_1(i), \dots, j_l(i)$ is equal to i .

Define varieties $V_{n+1,i}$ by

$$V_{n+1,i} = V_n \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} Z_i.$$

Then for any positive integer k , we have

$$V_{n+k,i} = V_n \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} (Z_i)_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}}^k.$$

Let π_0 be the map from G_{n+k} to G_n given by projection to the first n coordinates, and for $j = 1, \dots, k$, define projection maps

$$\pi_j : G_{n+k} \rightarrow G_{n+1}$$

as follows: If $(P_1, \dots, P_n, \dots, P_{n+k}) \in G_{n+k}$ then

$$\pi_j((P_1, \dots, P_n, \dots, P_{n+k})) = (P_1, \dots, P_n, P_{n+j}).$$

Recall that $G_{n+k} \subseteq (G_{n+1})_{G_n}^k$. We use this to define maps

$$(\sigma_0, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_i) : G_{n+k} \rightarrow V_{n+k,i}.$$

They act in the following manner: σ_0 is applied to G_n , while the σ_i are applied to the copies of G_{n+1} . In other words, if $P = (P_1, \dots, P_n, P_{n+1}, \dots, P_{n+k}) \in G_{n+k}$, then

$$(\sigma_0, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_i)(P) = (\sigma_0(P_1, \dots, P_n), \sigma_i(P_{n+1}), \dots, \sigma_i(P_{n+k})).$$

We have the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G_{n+k} & \xrightarrow{(\sigma_0, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_i)} & V_{n+k,i} \\ \downarrow \pi_j & & \downarrow \\ G_{n+1} & \longrightarrow & V_{n+1,i} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ G_n & \xrightarrow{\sigma_0} & V_n \end{array}$$

Recall from the proof of Lemma 4.3 that we defined Z to be the restriction of X^d to $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}$.

$$Z = C_1 \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} \cdots \times_{\tilde{\mathcal{B}}} C_d.$$

We know that G_{n+1} maps to Z and in fact, the σ_i 's factor through this map. So let

$$\tau : G_{n+1} \rightarrow W$$

be the map from G_{n+1} to Z , where W is the image of G_{n+1} in Z . Let

$$e : W \rightarrow Z$$

be the inclusion map from W to Z . Finally, define the projection maps

$$\rho_i : Z \rightarrow Z_i$$

where

$$\rho_i(C_1 \times_{\tilde{B}} \dots \times_{\tilde{B}} C_d) = C_{j_1(i)} \times_{\tilde{B}} \dots \times_{\tilde{B}} C_{j_l(i)}.$$

We have the diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & W & \\ \nearrow & & \searrow e \\ G_{n+1} & \longrightarrow & Z \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \rho_i \\ & & Z_i \end{array}$$

An important fact to notice is that the image in W of the fixed points Φ_{n+1} is not all of W . Why is this? Well, let's look at what the map $\tau : G_{n+1} \rightarrow W \subseteq Z$ does. Remember that $G_{n+1} \subseteq (X_B^{n+1})^d$ and that $Z = X^d|_{\tilde{B}}$. We can write a K -rational element, g , of G_{n+1} as

$$g = ((P_1, \dots, P_{n+1})^{\alpha_1}, \dots, (P_1, \dots, P_{n+1})^{\alpha_d})$$

where $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d$ are the embeddings of L into $\bar{K}$ fixing K . Then

$$\tau(g) = (P_{n+1}^{\alpha_1}, \dots, P_{n+1}^{\alpha_d}).$$

Therefore $\tau(g)$ is actually a Galois orbit. Recall that the P_{n+1} 's are defined over L but not any smaller field between L and K . Hence all of $P_{n+1}^{\alpha_1}, \dots, P_{n+1}^{\alpha_d}$ are distinct. Therefore, $\tau(G_{n+1}) = W$ is the closure of a set of points which are not fixed by the group action.

This fact that the fixed points do not surject to W will soon be very important.

We want to prove that every component of F_{n+k} of maximal dimension is a variety of general type. This means that if $\widetilde{F_{n+k}}$ is a resolution of singularities of F_{n+k} , we need to show that the dualizing sheaf $\omega_{\widetilde{F_{n+k}}}$ is big.

The main idea is to pull back sections of dualizing sheaves along our various projections. We know that both ω_{V_n} and $\omega_{V_{n+k,i}}$ are big for large n . ($\omega_{V_{n+k,i}}$ is big since the families of the curves C_i appear in $V_{n+k,i}$ with even larger exponents.) We would like to utilize the fact that $\omega_{V_{n+k,i}}$ is big to pull back a lot of sections to $\widetilde{G_{n+k}}$ which vanish along the fixed points of the group action (for

we will see that this is what suffices for F_{n+k} to be of general type). Unfortunately we can't pull back sections along any one projection of G_{n+k} to $V_{n+k,i}$; the sections pulled back in this way will not vanish along the fixed points. To overcome this difficulty we will pull back sections via all the various projections, tensor them together, and use our earlier lemmas to obtain that $\omega_{\widetilde{G_{n+k}}}$ is big, with lots of sections vanishing on the fixed points.

Recall that G_{n+k} is contained in a fiber power of families of stable curves over $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$, and, moreover, $\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}$ was chosen to be smooth and irreducible, with the property that its discriminant locus is a divisor of normal crossings. We appeal to Lemma 3.3 of [CHM], which states that this implies that any singularities of $V_{n+k,i}$ are canonical. This means that the singularities do not prohibit the extension of pluricanonical sections from the smooth locus to any desingularization. Therefore we may pull back sections of $V_{n+k,i}$ to $\widetilde{G_{n+k}}$. We have the following injection:

$$r^*(\sigma_0, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_i)^* \omega_{V_{n+k,i}} \hookrightarrow \omega_{\widetilde{G_{n+k}}}$$

and so

$$r^*(\otimes_i((\sigma_0, \sigma_i, \dots, \sigma_i))^* \omega_{V_{n+k,i}}) \hookrightarrow (\omega_{\widetilde{G_{n+k}}})^{\otimes d}$$

Now, the left-hand side above can be rewritten as:

$$r^*(\pi_0^* \sigma_0^* \omega_{V_n})^{\otimes d} \otimes r^*(\pi_1^* \otimes_i \sigma_i^* \omega_{Z_i/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}}) \otimes \dots \otimes r^*(\pi_k^* \otimes_i \sigma_i^* \omega_{Z_i/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}})$$

Notice in the second diagram above that

$$\sigma_i = \rho_i \circ e \circ \tau$$

Hence,

$$\sigma_i^* = \tau^* e^* \rho_i^*.$$

Let's look at one of the last k terms above (take some j such that $1 \leq j \leq k$):

$$\begin{aligned} r^*(\pi_j^* \otimes_i \sigma_i^* \omega_{Z_i/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}}) &= r^*(\pi_j^*(\otimes_i \tau^* e^* \rho_i^* \omega_{Z_i/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}})) \\ &= r^*(\pi_j^*(\otimes_i \tau^* e^*(\omega_{C_{j_1(i)}/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{C_{j_l(i)}/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}})) \\ &= r^*(\pi_j^* \tau^* e^*(\otimes_i (\omega_{C_{j_1(i)}/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{C_{j_l(i)}/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}})) \\ &= r^*(\pi_j^* \tau^* e^*(\omega_{C_1/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}}^{\otimes l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{C_d/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}}^{\otimes l_d})) \end{aligned}$$

The exponents l_i are defined by the last line above, and we are guaranteed that each one is positive. We know that for each i , one of the $j_k(i)$'s is equal to i ; hence we when we tensor over all i we know get each family C_i appearing some positive number l_i times.

Let M denote the line bundle

$$M = \omega_{C_1/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}}^{\otimes l_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \omega_{C_d/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}}^{\otimes l_d}.$$

We claim that M is a big line bundle on Z , and if we let M_W denote e^*M , then, in fact, M_W is big on W .

Recall that

$$M = \otimes_i \rho_i^* \omega_{Z_i/\widetilde{\mathcal{B}}}.$$

In other words,

$$M = \omega_{C_1/\tilde{B}}^{\otimes l_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \omega_{C_d/\tilde{B}}^{\otimes l_d}$$

where each l_i is positive.

As in the proof of Lemma 4.3, let $C_{i,o}$ be the pullback of $X \rightarrow B$ to $B_i \subseteq B$; recall that $\omega_{C_{i,0}/B_i}$ is big. Moreover, using techniques from the proof of Lemma 4.3, we know that $\omega_{(C_{i,0})_{B_i}^{l_i}}$ is big.

We have

$$Z \subseteq C_{1,0} \times \cdots \times C_{d,0} \rightarrow B_1 \times \cdots \times B_d$$

and each Z surjects to each B_i . Since each $\omega_{C_{i,0}/B_i}$ is big, it follows that each $\omega_{C_{i,0}/B_i}^{\otimes l_i}$ is also big. Therefore applying Lemma 3.5 we see that the pullback of $\otimes_i \omega_{C_{i,0}/B_i}^{\otimes l_i}$ to Z is big. This pullback is equal to

$$\omega_{C_1/\tilde{B}}^{\otimes l_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \omega_{C_d/\tilde{B}}^{\otimes l_d} = M$$

so M is big on Z . Now $W \subseteq Z$ and W surjects to each C_i since W is the image of G_{n+1} . Hence applying lemma 3.5 once again, we conclude that M_W is big on W .

Putting all of the above together, we see that

$$r^*(\pi_0^* \sigma_0^* \omega_{V_n})^d \otimes r^*(\pi_1^* \tau^* M_W) \otimes \cdots \otimes r^*(\pi_k^* \tau^* M_W) \hookrightarrow \omega_{\widetilde{G_{n+k}}}^{\otimes d}.$$

Recall that the image of the fixed points Φ_{n+1} in W is not all of W . Therefore this image forms a proper subvariety of W , and we obtain a non-zero ideal $\mathcal{I}$ of sections of M_W which vanish on this subvariety.

We now apply the following lemma, borrowed from [CHM].

Lemma 4.4 [see [CHM], Lemma 4.1] *Suppose that X is a projective variety with G a finite group of order l acting on X . Let θ be an m canonical form on X which is invariant under the group action of G . Then if θ vanishes to order $m(l-1)$ on the locus of all points of X fixed by the group action, then θ descends to smooth form on X/G .*

We use Lemma 4.4 to show that smooth pluricanonical forms on $\widetilde{G_{n+k}}$ descend to smooth forms on $\widetilde{F_{n+k}}$ modulo the group action, if the forms vanish to a prescribed order on the fixed point locus. Bear in mind that $\widetilde{G_{n+k}}$ modulo the group action is nothing more than $\widetilde{F_{n+k}}$, a desingularization of F_{n+k} . So to show that $\omega_{\widetilde{F_{n+k}}}$ is big for large k , we will show that $\omega_{\widetilde{G_{n+k}}}$ not only is big, but also has lots of sections vanishing to arbitrarily high order on the fixed point locus.

By the first statement of Lemma 4.2, we know that for some s the line bundle $M_W^{\otimes s} \otimes \mathcal{I}$ is big.

Look at the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \widetilde{G_{n+k}} & \xrightarrow{r} & G_{n+k} \hookrightarrow G_n \times W \times \cdots \times W \\ & \searrow & \downarrow \\ & & V_n \times W \times \cdots \times W \end{array}$$

Let $\mathcal{J}_\Phi$ be the locus of fixed points in G_{n+k} . Then

$$\sum_j \pi_j^{-1} \tau_j^{-1} \mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{J}_\Phi$$

and so

$$\prod_j \pi_j^{-1} \tau_j^{-1} \mathcal{J} \subset \mathcal{J}_\Phi^k$$

Therefore,

$$r^*(\pi_0^* \sigma_0^* \omega_{V_n})^{\otimes ds} \otimes r^*(\otimes_j \pi_j^* \tau_j^* M_W^{\otimes s} \otimes (\prod_j \pi_j^{-1} \tau_j^{-1} \mathcal{J})) \hookrightarrow \omega_{G_{n+k}}^{\otimes ds} \otimes \mathcal{J}_\Phi^k$$

We know that ω_{V_n} is big, and as in the proof of lemma 4.2, as long as $k > s$, $M_W^{\otimes s} \otimes (\prod_j \pi_j^{-1} \tau_j^{-1} \mathcal{J})$ is big. Therefore, for $k > s$ the entire left hand side above is big, so we have lots of sections of $\omega_{G_{n+k}}^{\otimes ds}$ vanishing to high order, and the proof is complete.

References

- [A] D. Abramovich, *Uniformité des points rationnels des courbes algébriques sur les extensions quadratiques et cubiques*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, t. 321, Série I, p. 755-758, 1995.
- [CHM] L. Caporaso, J. Harris, B. Mazur, *Uniformity of rational points*, J. Amer. Math. Soc., to appear
<ftp://ftp.math.harvard.edu/pub/uniformityofrationalpoints.tex>
- [V] E. Viehweg, *Die additivität der Kodaira dimension für projektive Faser Räume über varietäten des allgemeinen typs*, Jour. reine und angew. Math. 330, p. 132-142, 1982.